

### **Remarks**

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 6 and 14-15 have been indicated as having allowable subject matter. Claims 1, 3, 9, 10-13, 15-17, and 20 have been amended. Claims 5-6, and 14 have been cancelled. Claims 21-27 have been added. Reconsideration and re-examination of the application is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth herein.

1. Claims 3, 10-13, 15-17, and 20 have been amended to correct typographical and grammatical errors. Approval of these amendments by the Examiner is respectfully requested.
2. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 5, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,048,108 issued to Vincent et al.

Claim 1 has been amended to include all of the claim limitations of dependant claim 6, which has been indicated by the Examiner as being allowable if re-written in independent form to include all the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 5-6 have been cancelled. Because all of the claim limitations of claim 6 and its intervening claims have been added to claim 1, Vincent et al. does not teach all of the claim limitations of claim 1. Removal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 depends from independent claim 1. As previously discussed, Vincent et al. does not teach all the claim limitations of claim 1. Because Vincent et al. does not teach all the claim limitations of claim 1, Vincent et al. does not teach all the claim limitations of claim 7 except for the claim limitations contained therein. Removal of the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

3. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 8, and 19 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,717,813 issued to Harman in view of European Patent No. 0 290 188 A2 issued to Smith.

As previously discussed, claim 1 has been amended to include all of the claim limitations of dependant claim 6, which has been indicated by the Examiner as being allowable if re-written in independent form to include all the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Because all of the claim limitations of claim 6 and its intervening claims have been added to claim 1, the combination of Harman in view of Smith does not teach all the elements of claim 1. Removal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 8, and 19 depend from independent claim 1. As previously discussed, the combination of Harman in view of Smith does not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 1. Because the combination of Harman in view of Smith does not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 1, the combination of Harman in view of Smith does not teach or suggest all the elements of claims 2, 8 and 19. Removal of the rejection of claims 2, 8 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

4. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,730,892 issued to Anderson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,048,108 issued to Vincent.

As previously discussed, claim 1 has been amended to include all of the claim limitations of dependant claim 6, which has been indicated by the Examiner as being allowable if re-written in independent form to include all the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Because all of the claim limitations of claim 6 and its intervening claims have been added to claim 1, the combination of Anderson in view of Vincent does not teach or suggest all the

elements of claim 1. Removal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectively requested.

Claims 4 and 7 depend from independent claim 1. As previously discussed, the combination of Anderson in view of Vincent et al. does not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 1. Because the combination of Anderson in view of Vincent et al. does not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 1, the combination of Anderson in view of Vincent et al. does not teach or suggest all the elements of claims 4 and 7. Removal of the rejection of claims 4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectively requested.

5. The Examiner has rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,730,892 issued to Anderson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,048,108 issued to Vincent and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,755,018 issued to Heng.

Claim 3 depends from independent claim 1. As previously discussed, the combination of Anderson in view of Vincent does not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 1. Because the combination of Anderson in view of Vincent does not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 1, the combination of Anderson in view of Vincent does not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 3. Removal of the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectively requested.

6. The Examiner has rejected claims 9-11, 13, 16, 18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,730,892 issued to Anderson in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,211,462 issued to Wolfthal.

Claim 9 has been amended to correct a typographical error and to include all of the claim limitations of dependant claim 14, which has been indicated by the Examiner as being allowable

if re-written in independent form to include all the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 14 has been cancelled. Because all of the claim limitations of claim 14 and its intervening claims have been added to claim 9, the combination of Anderson in view of Wolfthal does not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 9. Removal of the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-11, 13, 16, and 20 depend from independent claim 9. As previously discussed, the combination of Anderson in view of Wolfthal does not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 9. Because the combination of Anderson in view of Wolfthal does not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 9, the combination of Anderson in view of Wolfthal does not teach or suggest all the elements of claims 10-11, 13, 16, and 20. Removal of the rejection of claims 10-11, 13, 16, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claim 18 depends from independent claim 1. As previously discussed, Anderson does not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 1. Because Anderson does not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 1, the combination of Anderson in view of Wolfthal does not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 18. Removal of the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

7. The Examiner has rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,730,892 issued to Anderson in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,211,462 issued to Wolfthal and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,755,018 issued to Heng.

Claim 12 depends from independent claim 9. As previously discussed, the combination of Anderson in view of Wolfthal does not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 9. Because the combination of Anderson in view of Wolfthal does not teach or suggest all the elements of

claim 9, the combination of Anderson in view of Wolfthal and further in view of Heng does not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 12. Removal of the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

8. The Examiner has rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,730,892 issued to Anderson in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,211,462 issued to Wolfthal and further in view of European Patent No. 0 290 188 A2 issued to Smith.

Claim 17 depends from independent claim 9. As previously discussed, the combination of Anderson in view of Wolfthal does not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 9. Because the combination of Anderson in view of Wolfthal does not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 9, the combination of Anderson in view of Wolfthal and further in view of Smith does not teach or suggest all the elements of claim 17. Removal of the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

9. New claims 21-27 have been added to the application.

Independent claim 21 is considered to be in condition for allowance, because the prior art fails to teach or suggest a housing for receiving an optical fiber having a receptacle for the optical fiber wherein the housing has a retention member formed integrally with the housing and initially supported in a pre-assembly position over the receptacle of the housing by at least one frangible web that is severable from the housing to completely separate the retention member from the housing when the retention member is displaced into an assembly position.

Claims 22-27 depend from independent claim 21. Because claim 21 is considered to be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth herein, claims 22-27 are also considered to be

in condition for allowance. Claims 22-27 are further considered to be in condition for allowance because the prior art fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of claims 22-27 in combination with the elements of their respective base claims and intervening claims.

Examination of new claims 21-27 is respectfully requested.

In view of the amendments and arguments presented herein, the application is considered to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and passage to issue is respectfully requested.

**A check in the amount of \$126.00 is attached for the addition of seven claims in excess of twenty. Please charge any additional fees associated with this application to Deposit Order Account No. 501581.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Roland Kraus, Applicant



Jennifer Mae Slonaker  
Registration No. 50568  
Attorney for Applicant  
Phone: 717.399.1535  
Facsimile: 717.291.4660

The PTO did not receive the following  
listed item(s) \$126.00 check